

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress  
1st Session

**Vote No. 22**

February 27, 1997, 5:09 pm  
Page S-1722 Temp. Record

## BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT/Spending of Prior Year Surpluses

**SUBJECT:**      **Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment . . . S. J. Res. 1. Kyl motion to table the Feingold amendment No. 14.**

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 60-40

**SYNOPSIS:**      As reported, S. J. Res. 1, the Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment: will require a three-fifths majority vote of both Houses of Congress to deficit spend or to increase the public debt limit; will require the President's annual proposed budget submission to be in balance; and will require a majority of the whole number of each House to approve any bill to increase revenue. Congress will be allowed to waive these requirements for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. Congress will enforce and implement this amendment by appropriate legislation. The amendment will take effect in fiscal year 2002 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later. The States will have 7 years to ratify the amendment. For related debate, see 103rd Congress, second session, vote Nos. 47-48, 104th Congress, first session, vote Nos. 62-63 and 65-98, and 104th Congress, second session, vote No. 158.

**The Feingold amendment** would amend section 1 to allow total outlays for a fiscal year to exceed total receipts if Congress provided by law that an accumulated budget surplus from a prior year or years would be used to offset the current-year deficit.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Kyl moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

This Feingold amendment seeks to make it easier to spend away any surpluses Congress manages to acquire. This strikes us as an ill-advised policy. It would be much better to leave it under the lockbox protection of the three-fifths majority deficit spending requirement than to leave it sitting on the table, unguarded. Leaving it unguarded would almost certainly result in it being whisked away in yet another Washington spending frenzy. It as though our liberal spending colleagues are saying that they think that it is bad

(See other side)

| YEAS (60)                   |                         |          | NAYS (40)                |                          | NOT VOTING (0)     |                  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Republicans<br>(55 or 100%) | Democrats<br>(5 or 11%) |          | Republicans<br>(0 or 0%) | Democrats<br>(40 or 89%) | Republicans<br>(0) | Democrats<br>(0) |
| Abraham                     | Hutchinson              | Bryan    | Akaka                    | Johnson                  |                    |                  |
| Allard                      | Hutchison               | Byrd     | Baucus                   | Kennedy                  |                    |                  |
| Ashcroft                    | Inhofe                  | Graham   | Biden                    | Kerrey                   |                    |                  |
| Bennett                     | Jeffords                | Landrieu | Bingaman                 | Kerry                    |                    |                  |
| Bond                        | Kempthorne              | Robb     | Boxer                    | Kohl                     |                    |                  |
| Brownback                   | Kyl                     |          | Breaux                   | Lautenberg               |                    |                  |
| Burns                       | Lott                    |          | Bumpers                  | Leahy                    |                    |                  |
| Campbell                    | Lugar                   |          | Cleland                  | Levin                    |                    |                  |
| Chafee                      | Mack                    |          | Conrad                   | Lieberman                |                    |                  |
| Coats                       | McCain                  |          | Daschle                  | Mikulski                 |                    |                  |
| Cochran                     | McConnell               |          | Dodd                     | Moseley-Braun            |                    |                  |
| Collins                     | Murkowski               |          | Dorgan                   | Moynihan                 |                    |                  |
| Coverdell                   | Nickles                 |          | Durbin                   | Murray                   |                    |                  |
| Craig                       | Roberts                 |          | Feingold                 | Reed                     |                    |                  |
| D'Amato                     | Roth                    |          | Feinstein                | Reid                     |                    |                  |
| DeWine                      | Santorum                |          | Ford                     | Rockefeller              |                    |                  |
| Domenici                    | Sessions                |          | Glenn                    | Sarbanes                 |                    |                  |
| Enzi                        | Shelby                  |          | Harkin                   | Torricelli               |                    |                  |
| Faircloth                   | Smith, Bob              |          | Hollings                 | Wellstone                |                    |                  |
| Frist                       | Smith, Gordon           |          | Inouye                   | Wyden                    |                    |                  |
| Gorton                      | Snowe                   |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Gramm                       | Specter                 |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Grams                       | Stevens                 |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Grassley                    | Thomas                  |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Gregg                       | Thompson                |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Hagel                       | Thurmond                |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Hatch                       | Warner                  |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |
| Helms                       |                         |          |                          |                          |                    |                  |

**EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:**  
1—Official Business  
2—Necessarily Absent  
3—Illness  
4—Other

**SYMBOLS:**  
AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

enough that this constitutional amendment is going to require the budget to be balanced, but they simply cannot stand the thought that it is going to make it difficult to spend away any actual reduction in the debt that may be achieved. When the amendment goes into effect in 2002, the debt held by the public will be \$4.7 trillion. We are not happy with the thought of keeping the debt at that level in perpetuity; we should pay it off. The Feingold amendment, for all practical purposes, would make it virtually impossible to pay down any of that debt. We therefore urge our colleagues to table this amendment.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

We oppose the Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment, but that fact does not relieve us of our responsibility to try and improve it in the event that it may pass. On this basis we have offered the Feingold amendment. The Feingold amendment would allow budget surpluses accumulated in prior years to be spent in future years without being counted as increased spending in those years. Doing so would allow Congress to run surpluses in good economic years and to spend those surpluses in bad economic years without having them count as deficit spending. Over a period of years, the budget would still be balanced. We think this type of flexibility would make the amendment much more workable. Our opinion is not based on some idle theory; we know that some States, including Wisconsin, have adopted this approach and it has worked. The Senate should learn from the States' experience, and pass the Feingold amendment.